The University of Chicago

HUMANISTIC DOCTRINES OF THE PRINCE FROM PETRARCH TO SIR THOMAS ELYOT: A STUDY OF THE PRINCIPAL ANALOGUES AND SOURCES OF *THE BOKE NAMED THE GOVERNOUR*

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

1937

By

LESLIE C. WARREN

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939

The University of Chicago

HUMANISTIC DOCTRINES OF THE PRINCE FROM PETRARCH TO SIR THOMAS ELYOT: A STUDY OF THE PRINCIPAL ANALOGUES AND SOURCES OF *THE BOKE NAMED THE GOVERNOUR*

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

1937

By

LESLIE C. WARREN

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CHAPTER V

THE COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNOUR

In the "Proheme" to The Governour addressed to Henry VIII Sir Thomas Elyot protests that two considerations have induced him to undertake the following work, namely, the love of his country and his devotion to his king.[1] No desire for personal glory has motivated him in writing this political treatise, but the conviction that only by proper education can governors be more worthy of rule in the public weal. Like Petrarch and the long succession of Humanists who followed him Elyot stresses the importance of an humanistic education for the prince or governor.

> Wherfore takinge comforte and boldenesse, partly of your graces most benevolent inclination towarde the universall weale of your subiectes, partly inflamed with zele, I have now enterprised to describe in our vulgare tunge the fourme of a juste publike weale: whiche mater I have gathered as well of the sayenges of most noble autours (grekes and latynes) as by myne owne experience, I beinge continually trayned in some dayly affaires of the publike weale of this your moste noble realme all moste from my chyldhode. Whiche attemptate is nat of presumption to teach any persone, I myselfe havinge most need of teachinge: but onely to the intent that men which wil be studious about the weale publike may fynde the thinge therto expedient compendiously writen. And for as moch as this present boke treateth of the education of them that hereafter may be demed worthy to be governours of the publike weale under your hyghnesse (whiche Plato affirmeth to be the firste and chiefe part of a publyke weale; Solomon sayenge also where governours be not the people shall fall in to ruyne). I therefore have named it The Governour, and do nowe dedicate it unto your hyghnesse as the fyrste frutes of my studye. . . . .[2]

Elyot, now about forty years old, had chosen for himself the career of the governor, as he defined it in his book. Although one of the great scholars of his age, he never retired from active public life and he never undertook any literary work which he did not deem immediately and practically useful, and beneficial to his king and his country. Humanist and man of affairs, Elyot, the

---

[1] Sir Thomas Elyot, The Boke Named the Governour, ed. by H. H. S. Croft (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1883), I, cxci.

[2] Ibid., pp. cxci-cxciii.

man, is a most significant figure in the humanistic political thought of the Renaissance.

Sir Thomas Elyot's father, Sir Richard Elyot, was one of the "new" men advanced to high public office by Henry VII. Long a prominent lawyer, he was made a sergeant-at-law in 1503 and in the same year was appointed Attorney-General to the Queen Consort.[1] At the opening of Henry VIII's reign we find him serving as Justice of Assize for the Western Circuit, an office which he held until his death in 1522.[2] The son, Thomas Elyot, born not later than 1490, belonged completely to the new order represented by the Tudor dynasty.[3] His hatred of feudalism and clericalism, his patriotic nationalism, his belief in absolute monarchy were common to the society in which he was reared. More than this, Elyot's father must have been aware of the intellectual aspects of this new order, and a partisan of the New Learning, for he did not send his son to either university where the medieval system of education still prevailed but had him educated in the humanities by tutors in his own house.[4] This was not, however, the only education Elyot received. Stapleton tells us that he was on friendly terms with the leading Humanists of his day, Erasmus, Colet, Tunstall, Fisher, Grocyn, Linacre, Pace, and Lupset; and that both Elyot and his

---

[1]H. H. S. Croft, "Life of Elyot" in Elyot, The Governour, I, xxix.

[2]See Great Britain, Public Record Office, Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, I, 12, for first commission mentioned; ibid., III, Pt. II, 889, last commission granted to Sir Richard Elyot, February 4, 1522.

[3]Croft, "Life of Elyot" in Elyot, The Governour, I, xxx.

[4]The following passage which appears in the Latin "Address to the Readers" in Elyot's Dictionary (London: T. Berthelet, 1538) clarifies this point: "Tandem ne minis longa prefacione, vobis in rebus maioribus atq; gravioribus occupatis, potius fastidium q benefitium afferam, id breviter a vobis impetrare cupio, ut meam voluntatem in hac re aequi boniq; consulatis. Cogitetisq; vosipsos, id operis iam coeptum ab equite britanno, barbarissimo scilicet, utpote in paternis tantum aedibus educato, nec ab anno aetatis duodecimo ab altero quopiam preceptore literis instructo, sibi ipsi nimirum duce tam in scientiis liberalibus, qui utraque philosophia: quod procul abest, ut ostentando dicam vel arroganter: sed ut gratiis Deo Opt. Max. cum a me tum ab his, quibus hic meus liber fuerit utilis, utrinq; redditis: alii musarum uberiori benefitio freti, meo quidem exemplo, parem aut maiorem operam aggredi, pro sua Republica non dubitarent."

wife carried on literary studies in the school of More.[1]

That Elyot was an able classical scholar there can be no doubt. He had read widely in practically all extant classical Latin literature and in the Humanistic Latin literature of his own day.[2] His comments on Greek authors in the early chapters of The Governour,[3] the fact that he translated a treatise of Plutarch's,[4] and his strictures on the translations of Aristotle's Ethics[5] are evidence of his knowledge of Greek. In addition to the Greek poets whom he discusses in The Governour, Elyot had also undoubtedly read in Greek the philosophical works of Plato, Aristotle, and Plutarch.[6] Just how completely his literary tastes and philosophical views were formed by the New Learning Elyot himself tells us in a letter to Cromwell written in 1536.

> Sir, as ye knowe, I have ben ever desyrouse to reade many bookes specially concerning humanitie and moral philosophy, and therefore of such studies, I have a competent numbre. But concerning holy scripture I have very fewe, for in questionistes I never delyted, unsavery gloses and commentes I ever abhorred, the bostars and advauntars of the pompouse authoritie of the Bushop of Rome I never esteemyd.[7]

Elyot's education, however, was not limited to the humanities. As we might expect from the decidedly practical bent of his mind, he studied both law and medicine and attained some degree of proficiency in both. Elyot devotes an entire chapter in The Governour to emphasizing the importance of the study of law for the future governor and to advocating legal reforms based on the Roman civil law.[8] Elyot, himself, usually very modest in discussing his own accomplishments, writes of the law as "that honorable studie wherby my father was advaunced to a iuge, and also I my self have attayned no lytel commoditie."[9] Elyot was also deeply

---

[1]Thomas Stapleton, The Life and Illustrious Martyrdom of Sir Thomas More, tr. by Philip E. Hallett (London: Burns, Oates, & Washbourne, Ltd., 1928), p. 44.

[2]Elyot, The Governour, Vol. I, Bk. I, chaps. x and xi.

[3]Ibid., I, 56-60.

[4]Infra, p. 90.

[5]Elyot, The Governour, I, 92.

[6]W. H. Woodward, Education during the Age of the Renaissance (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1906), p. 270.

[7]Printed in Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cxxvi.

[8]Elyot, The Governour, Vol. I, Bk. I, chap. xiv.

[9]Ibid., I, 144-45.

interested in the study of medicine and in the dissemination among laymen of medical information. In 1534 he published a medical treatise in English, The Castel of Helth, in the preface of which he gives a detailed account of his medical studies:

> Nor whan I wrate fyrste this boke, I was not all ignorante in phisycke; fore before that I was xx. yeres olde, a worshipfull phisition, and one of the moste renoumed at that tyme in England, perceyvyng me by nature inclined to knowledge, rad unto me the workes of Galene of temperamentes, natural faculties, the Introduction of Johanicius, with some of the aphorismes of Hippocrates. And afterwarde by mine owne study, I radde over in order the more parte of the warkes of Hippocrates, Galen, Oribasius, Paulus Celius, Alexander Trallianus, Celsus, Plinius the one and the other, with Dioscorydes. Nor I dyd ommit to reade the longe Canones of Avicena, the Commentaries of Averrois, the practisis of Isake, Halyabbas, Rasys, Mesue, and also of the more part of them which were their aggregatours and followers. And all thoughe I have never ben at Montpelier, Padua, nor Salern, yet have I found somethynge in phisyckes, whereby I have taken no litle profyte concernynge myne owne helthe.[1]

This passage is especially important for the reference to the "worshipfull phisition" whom most authorities have identified as Thomas Linacre.[2] If this identification is correct then Elyot in his adolescent years had for a tutor the best Greek scholar in London at that time and one of the greatest English Humanists of the sixteenth century. Both by birth and education the author of

---

[1]Sir Thomas Elyot, The Castel of Helth, corrected and in some places augmented by the first author thereof Sir T. E. (3d ed.; London: T. Berthelet, 1541), Aii ff.

[2]Croft adopts this view ("Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cviii). More recently W. H. Woodward (Education during the Age of the Renaissance, p. 268) has taken the same position. Professor Berdan (Early Tudor Poetry, pp. 304-5, n. 1), however, thinks it improbable that Linacre is the physician referred to. He says, "The passage was written to justify Elyot's right to authorship of a book on medicine. As Linacre had been appointed royal physician, and as his reputation was very great, surely, had Elyot studied with him, he would have emphasized that fact here. Since he does not, certainly the assumption is contrary to the usual statement."

Berdan overlooks the fact that in publishing a medical treatise in English Elyot knew that he was doing something very unorthodox and sure to arouse the ire of the medical profession. In the Preface to the 1541 edition Elyot complains that this did happen. It is quite possible that Elyot, out of respect for the reputation of the late Court physician, refrained from mentioning Linacre's name in connection with a work frowned upon by the whole medical fraternity. Certainly if he had, he would have been accused of taking undue liberties with the name of England's greatest physician. I think we may continue to accept the view that Elyot had studied with Linacre.

The Governour belonged to the new order in England. Impatient of theological studies, he devoted himself whole heartedly to Greek and Latin literature, to philosophy and to law and medicine.

But while Elyot's aptitudes were primarily scholarly he was not content either to live in scholarly retirement or to restrict himself to the small circle of the learned. He led an active public life, as we shall see a little later, but principally, as a scholar, he devoted his talents to the service of his country. One of Elyot's most profound convictions was that the governing class of England must be educated and he took it upon himself to accomplish that end.[1] He believed, with Plato, that the security of the state depended upon the proper education of its governors. All of his literary work was undertaken to combat the widespread ignorance of the English gentleman and noble, which he deplored in preface after preface.[2] This literary activity begins with The Boke Named the Governour published in 1531. Elyot's next important work, 1533, "A disputacion Platonike," a series of five dialogues which he entitled Of the Knowledg Which Maketh a Wise Man, treats the proper relation between a counselor and his prince. This was a favorite theme of Elyot's and a vital one, too, in an age when counselors lost their heads for thwarting the will of the sovereign. This interesting and highly original work was suggested by the story told by Diogenes Laertius of Plato's experience at the court of the tyrant, Dionysius.[3] Elyot's Plato, having returned to Athens, reviews his actions and defends his refusal to flatter the tyrant and condone his vicious caprices as Aristippus did. Here again Elyot addresses the governors and future governors of England on a significant political problem. In 1540 appeared Elyot's last political work, The Image of Governaunce. In The Governour Elyot promised a second work which would discuss "the perfection of a iuste publike weale."[4] In the "Preface" to the latter work he recalls his promise. "And for as muche as in this boke was expressed of governaunce so perfyte an image, I supposed, that I should sufficiently discharge my selfe

---

[1] Supra, p. 85.

[2] See especially "The Proheme" to the Of the Knowledg Which Maketh a Wise Man, and the Preface to The Image of Governaunce and, of course, chaps. xii and xiii of Bk. I of The Governour.

[3] Elyot, The Governour, I, 6.

[4] Ibid., p. 24.

of my promise, if I did now publishe this boke, whiche (excepte I be muche deceived) shall minister to the wise readers bothe pleasyre and profite."[1] Elyot found his perfect public weal in the book of Eucolpius, "wherin were contayned the actes and sentences notable, of the most noble emperour Alexandre, for his wisdome and gravitee called Severus."[2] This book, better than any other of his works, reflects Elyot's ideal of the wise and benevolent, but absolute, monarch ruling in a state where the different degrees and conditions of men are perfectly ordered.

Absolute monarchy and something closely approximating a caste system were two leading articles in Elyot's political faith. A comparison of this perfect public weal with More's Utopian state and with the constitutional monarchy which Pole recommends in Starkey's dialogue emphasizes the more the ideal of the all-powerful, nationalistic, secular, and absolute monarchical state, in which Elyot believed. To understand Elyot's political thought one must study the Image of Governaunce as the intended sequel to The Governour. In addition to these three political studies Elyot published several minor works, all of which were inspired by his life-long ambition to achieve an educated governing class. They are: The Education or Bringing up of Children, translated oute of Plutarche (1532-33);[3] Pasquil the Playne (1533); Doctrinal of Princes (1534), a translation of an oration of Isocrates; the Castel of Helth (1534); the Bankette of Sapience (1534), a compilation of wise sayings from Seneca, Cicero, the Church Fathers,

---

[1]Sir Thomas Elyot, Image of Governaunce (London: T. Berthelet, 1549), Aii^{r}-Aii^{v}.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Croft does not attempt to date this work definitely but assigns it to the period before 1540. The British Museum Catalogue assigns it to 1536(?). In the Preface to the Image of Governaunce (1540) Elyot gives a list of his works, which I have found to be roughly chronological. Here the Education of Children appears after The Doctrinal of Princes and before Pasquil the Playne, which appeared in 1533. This date, 1532-33, is substantiated by an entry in the Letters and Papers, VI, 337, assigned by the editor to July, 1533. This is a letter from Martin Tindall to Cromwell. "This young man has just completed a translation of Erasmus's Life of Colet and of Vitrari from Epistles and sends them to Cromwell with many excuses. He excuses the imperfections of the English because he had seen no translations but Sir Thos. Elyot's Plutarche." We may conclude from this evidence that this translation appeared not later than two years after the publication of The Governour.

and others; a translation of a sermon of St. Cyprian, together with Pico's rules for a Christian life (1534); a Latin-English Dictionary (1538); a Defence of Good Women (1538); A Preservative agaynste Deth (1545); and finally, a work dealing with English history, not now extant and perhaps never published, but almost certainly written entitled De rebus memorabilibus Angliae.[1]

That Elyot enjoyed a wide reputation as a scholar, educator, and apologist for the Tudor despotism there can be little doubt. His courageous and persistent attempts to combat the prejudices of the English governing class against the New Learning made him widely known and respected both by his contemporaries and by succeeding generations. Henry VIII recognized his ability and gave him encouragement, especially in undertaking his dictionary.[2] Ascham praised him as a man, "whiche surelie for his lerning in all kynde of knowlege bringeth much worshyp to all the nobilitie of Englande, ..."[3] And Wood, writing in the next century, confirms these earlier judgments.

> He was a very good Grammarian, Grecian, Poet Philosopher, Physician, and what not to compleat a Gentleman. He was admired by, and beloved of Scholars, and his Memory was celebrated by them in their respective Works, particularly by Leland his contemporary. The truth is, his Learning in all kinds of Knowledge brought him much Honour to all the Gentry and Nobility of England.[4]

Elyot's scholarly pursuits, however, were but one phase of his life. He had a very keen sense of civic responsibility and, like Palmieri, he considered holding public office the privilege as well as the duty of the well-born and the virtuous. Palmieri and Elyot agreed that private studies should be undertaken only that some public good might come of them. We have observed that Elyot followed this principle in all his literary undertakings as a "governour." Elyot regarded administration of public affairs as his proper sphere.

---

[1]For a summary of all the evidence on this point see Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, clxxii ff.

[2]See Preface to this work addressed to Henry VIII, quoted from Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, pp. cxxxiv ff. (Abstract in Letters & Papers, XIII, Pt. II, 356.)

[3]Roger Ascham, Toxophilus, The Whole Works, ed. by Rev. Dr. Giles (London: John Russel Smith, 1864), II, 77.

[4]Anthony Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis (2d ed.; London: R. Knaplock, D. Midwinter, and J. Tonson, 1721), I, 67.

He tells us in the passage from the "Proheme" to The Governour already quoted that he had been "continually trayned in some dayly affaires of the publike weale . . . . all moste from my chyldhode."[1] The first office Thomas Elyot held of which we have record was clerk of the Justices of Assize of the Western Circuit.[2] It will be recalled that his father, Sir Richard Elyot, was one of the justices. The younger Elyot was probably about twenty or twenty-two years of age at this time. He received a salary of one hundred marks.[3] In 1522 he came into possession of an estate at Combe in Oxfordshire by the death of his father and two estates in Cambridgeshire which he inherited from maternal relatives.[4] Master Elyot was now to be numbered among the substantial gentry of the realm.

In 1523 he was promoted by Wolsey without solicitation to be Clerk of the Council.[5] A patent was granted to him for this office in 1527 and he was induced to give up his former clerkship.[6] However, a legal difficulty arose over a prior grant of the clerkship of the Council, and in 1530 Elyot was dismissed from his office after six and one-half years of service without remuneration. He was, as he pithily remarks, "discharged without any recompence, rewarded only with the order of Knighthode, honorable and onerouse, having moche lesse to lyve on than bifore."[7] During the years, 1522-1530 his name appears frequently on royal commissions for Wiltshire, Oxfordshire, and Cambridgeshire. In November, 1727, he was appointed sheriff of Oxfordshire and Berkshire for the following year.[8]

The Governour appeared early in 1531 and in September of that year Elyot was appointed Ambassador to the Court of Charles V.

---

[1] Supra, p. 85.

[2] Letters and Papers, I, 262.

[3] Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, xl.

[4] Ibid., p. xlvi.

[5] Sir Henry Ellis, Original Letters, Illustrative of English History, 1st ser. (London: Harding, Triphook, & Lepard, 1824), II, 115.

[6] Letters and Papers, IV, Pt. II, 1865.

[7] Ellis, Original Letters, 1st ser., II, 117.

[8] Letters and Papers, IV, Pt. II, 1610.

This was Elyot's first important public service. Chapuys describes him at this time as "a gentleman of 700 or 800 ducats of rent, formerly in the Cardinal's service, now in that of the lady, who has promoted him to this charge."[1] The "lady" is, of course, Anne Boleyn. It is to be noted that Elyot belonged to the same party at Court as Cromwell. We shall have occasion to discuss their friendship later. The purpose of Elyot's embassy was to secure the neutrality of Charles in the impending matter of the divorce.[2] Despite the fact that Elyot belonged to Anne Boleyn's party and was devoted to Henry, according to Chapuys, he sympathized with Katherine.[3] Apparently, Elyot could on occasion be the bold counselor he praised in his Of the Knowledg that Maketh a Wise Man. Perhaps Elyot's sympathy for Katherine accounts for his sudden recall in February of 1532. Henry's explanation to Chapuys was that Elyot had been recalled at his wife's request.[4] Elyot, nonetheless, continued to favor the Queen's cause; in a letter of January, 1534, to Charles Chapuys refers to Elyot as a partisan of the Queen.[5] This partisanship went even further, if we accept Professor Watson's opinion that the Defence of Good Women, written sometime between the years 1531 to 1538, "appears to be a slightly

---

[1] Ibid., V, 205.

[2] Ibid., p. 768 (appendix). Elyot's instructions have been reprinted in Nicholas Pocock (ed.), Records of the Reformation (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1870), II, 329.

[3] Letters and Papers, V, 489, June 5, 1532, Letter of Chapuys to Charles V: "The day before yesterday Sir Thos. Eliot came to visit him, and gave him a long account of the conversation he had had with the King. He has deserved well of the Emperor and of the Queen, but principally of the King himself, though it is very doubtful whether he wished to hear what he said. It is a long time since he has been remonstrated with in this manner, but a laugh or a tear of the lady counteracts everything. Elyot has sent the discourse to Senor Fernando de la Peulla, in a cipher which he left with him, as, he says, the Emperor knows."

[4] Ibid., pp. 369-70.

[5] Ibid., VII, 47, January 29, 1534, Letter of Chapuys to Charles V: "Has just received his letter of the 24th ult. As to the sending of personages which the Queen desires, I have never had much hope that they would persuade the King or obtain leave from him to appear in Parliament to act in the Queen's behalf. I was moved to write about it by the Queen's order and the request of several persons of whom Elyot was not the last, and he was instigated from a good quarter, as he himself told me. Though Eliot ought not to be considered one of the principal, I mention him because you know him. . . . ."

disguised defence of Queen Catherine."[1] Elyot's courageous stand on this great issue is interesting for its bearing on his political philosophy. He believed that the power of the monarch should be absolute and he also insisted on the right of the king's counselors to speak their minds frankly and boldly. Indeed, he held it was their duty so to do. But it was the privilege of the king to reject the advice of his counselors, in which case it became the duty of the counselor to submit to the will of his prince. This was accepted doctrine which even More would have subscribed to on any issue except the religious question. There was, therefore, no inconsistency in Elyot's conduct involved in this support of Katherine and in taking the oath to the Succession and the Supremacy. The counselor's duty was fulfilled and his conscience clear when he had delivered his honest opinion. According to Roper, Elyot undertook a second embassy to Charles in 1535.[2] However, since there is no other record extant that Elyot was out of England at this time, Roper's statement must be regarded as doubtful.[3]

During the years 1532 to 1535, in addition to publishing several books, Elyot was performing his accustomed functions again. He was appointed sheriff of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire in 1532,[4] and he was named as the Commissioner for the Peace in Oxfordshire and Cambridgeshire in the same year.[5] In January, 1535, Elyot was appointed one of the commissioners for the visitation of the religious houses.[6] Cromwell was undoubtedly instru-

---

[1]Foster Watson, "Introduction," Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1912), p. 19.

[2]William Roper, The Lyfe of Sir Thomas More, Knighte, ed. by Elsie Vaughan Hitchcock ("Early English Text Society"; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1935), pp. 103-04.

[3]Croft accepts Roper's statement, adducing the evidence that an English ambassador was known to be with Charles at Naples at this time. Croft conjectures that Elyot probably borrowed the manuscript of Eucolpius at this time from the "gentill man of Naples" referred to in The Image of Governaunce (pp. cxvii ff.). Apparently Croft forgot that in the same context Elyot says that he made this translation "about nine yeeres passed," that is, in 1531; so he could scarcely have borrowed the book in 1535 (see Preface to Image of Governaunce, Aiir).

[4]Letters and Papers, V, 698. [5]Ibid., p. 700.

[6]Ibid., VIII, 49-50, January, 1535, Commission to inquire into the Tenths of the Spiritualities. Sir Thomas Elyot's name appears for Oxfordshire and town of Oxford.

mental in securing his appointment. In a letter of July 2, 1536, he thanks Cromwell for his good offices and asks to be rewarded for his services on this commission with some portion of the suppressed monastic lands.[1] In another letter to Cromwell, undated, he renews his request.[2] In 1539 Elyot's labors were rewarded. He was granted a manor formerly in the possession of the monastery of Eneshan.[3] These facts serve to identify Elyot with the party of Cromwell. Like Cromwell, Elyot believed in the supremacy of the secular over the clerical power and willingly aided in the spoliation of the monasteries. One need ascribe no mean motives to Elyot's participation in the destruction of the monasteries. We have noted repeatedly the secular tendency in humanistic political thought. This secularism is very strikingly evident not only in Elyot's writings but also in his political activities.

After Cromwell's fall Elyot continued to be active in

---

[1]Reprinted in Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cxxix-cxxxi. The following passages are interesting in this connection: "My lorde, for as moche as I suppose that the Kinges most gentill communicacion with me and allso his moste comfortable report unto the lordes of me proceded of your afore remembred recommendacions, I am animate to importune your good lordship with moste harty desyres to continue my goode lorde in augmenting the Kinges good estimacion of me, whereof I promise you before godd your lordship shall never have cause to repent."

"And where my speciall trust and onely expectation is to be holpen by the meanes of your lordship, and natural shame fastness more raigneth in me than is necessary, so that I wold not prese to the Kinges maiesty withoute your lordshippes assistence unto whome I have sondry tymes declarid myn indigence, and where of it hath hapned, I therefor moste humbly desyre you, my speciall goode lorde, so to bryng me into the Kinges most noble remembrance that of his moste bounteouse liberality it may like his highnesse to reward me with some convenyent porcion of his suppressid landes whereby I may be able to contynue my life according to that honest degree whereunto his grace hath callid me. And that your lordship forgete not that neither of his grace, nor of any other person I have fee, office, pencion, or ferme, nor have any manner of lucre or advauntage besydes the revenues of my poure land which are but small and no more than I may there with mayntayne my poure house. And if by your lordshippes meanes I may achieve goode effect of my sute your lordship shall not fynde me ingrate. And whatsoever porcion of land that I shall attayne by the Kinges gift, I promyse to give to your lordship the first yeres frutes with myn assured and faithfull hart and servyce."

[2]MS Public Record Office, Cromwell Correspondence, Vol. X, No. 58. Printed by Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cxvi.

[3]Letters and Papers, XIV, Pt. II, 298.

public affairs. In 1542 he was elected to Parliament for the borough of Cambridge.[1] In 1543 and 1544 he again was appointed sheriff for Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire.[2] Final mention of Elyot as a Tudor official occurs in the list of commissioners appointed to take the muster in the various shires. Sir Thomas Elyot was commissioner for Cambridgeshire.[3] This entry is dated January 20, 1546. Elyot died two months later on March 26. Sir Thomas Elyot's long continued and faithful service to his king and to his country form an invaluable commentary on the political idealism which inspired his literary work. Loyalty to his king, independence and personal integrity as a counselor, and faith in the secular ideal of a centralized national monarchy are the outstanding characteristics of Elyot as a public servant.

During the long term of Elyot's public life he was on friendly if not intimate terms with England's two most powerful political figures of this period--Sir Thomas More and Thomas Cromwell. His friendship with these statesmen who held two diametrically opposed political philosophies presents a problem the solution of which is most important for an understanding of Elyot's political thought.

More, born in 1478, was probably at least ten years Elyot's senior. As a young man Elyot shared More's enthusiasm for humanistic learning, and, as we have already noted, attended his "School" and pursued literary studies there.[4] Furthermore, Elyot reflects in his writings and in his actions some measure of the humanistic idealism of this earlier generation of Humanists, Colet, Erasmus, More, Vives. His defence of Katherine is sufficient evidence of an unimpeachable integrity and an acute sense of justice. Nonetheless Elyot's political philosophy differed fundamentally from More's, and as Elyot took his modest place at Henry's court, he must have found himself rather consistently in opposition to More's policies. We recall that Chapuys described him in 1531 as being formerly in Wolsey's service and now in Anne Boleyn's.[5] The Boleyn faction was the Protestant party, the party with which

---

[1] Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, clxvi.

[2] Letters and Papers, XVIII, Pt. II, 244, and ibid., XXI, Pt. II, 222.

[3] Ibid., XXI, Pt. I, 40.

[4] Supra, pp. 86-87. [5] Ibid., p. 93.

Cromwell was allied at this time. The political orbits of More and Cromwell were mutually exclusive and at this time Elyot definitely revolved in the orbit of Cromwell. Elyot's choice is not difficult to explain. He believed that England should be a strong national state ruled by an absolute monarch. This is the essential difference between Elyot's political philosophy and that of More and Erasmus. The latter reflected a cosmopolitanism which was a modification of the medieval ideal of Christendom, an internationalism which Elyot could not accept. Elyot thought only in terms of England. Like Wyclif, he apparently had no conception of the political entity of Christendom. In Elyot the political trend toward nationalism and the Humanistic movement are fused into a political faith at once idealistic and practical as a plan of immediate action. This fusion, which we have noted as characteristic of humanistic political thought since the earliest days of the Renaissance, made Elyot the natural ally of Cromwell. Thus on the religious issue he supported the advocate of a State church under secular control. In the passage of the letter to Cromwell quoted above, he emphatically says that he never esteemed "the bostars and advauntars of the pompouse authoritie of the Busshop of Rome."[1] It was not only on the religious question that More's and Elyot's conceptions of the state conflicted. In the first chapter of The Governour in which he argues that "publike weale" is a more accurate rendering of respublica than "commune weale" and preferable to the latter in designating the English state, Elyot shows his contempt for More's ideal state. "And they which do suppose it so to be called for that [i.e. "commune weale"], that every thinge shulde be to all men in commune, without discrepance of any astate or condition, be thereto moved more by sensualitie than by any good reason or inclination to humanitie."[2] It is conceivable that Elyot had the Utopia specifically in mind when he wrote this passage. Elyot's national state, "compacte or made of sondry astates and degrees of men,"[3] had little in common with More's ideal. It is clear then that as early as 1531, while Elyot undoubtedly respected More as a great Humanist, he was opposed to him politically and probably was no longer an intimate, if he ever had been. It is not in the least surprising, then,

---

[1] Supra, p. 87.

[2] Elyot, The Governour, I, 2. [3] Ibid.

nor does it indicate any servility in Elyot's character, that he should write to Cromwell in 1536 concerning the late Sir Thomas More, in the following terms. "I therfor beseche your goode lordship now to lay apart the remembraunce of the amity betwene me and sir Thomas More, which was but usque ad aras, as in the proverb, consydering that I was never so moche addict unto hym as I was unto truthe and fidelity toward my soveraigne lorde as godd is my juge."[1] No doubt More and Elyot had a common ground of understanding in the literary studies in which they both delighted but politically they were poles apart, and had Cromwell not been blinded by jealousy of his great rival he would have realized the absurdity of his suspicions.

We have already seen that Elyot's political beliefs made him quite naturally a supporter of Thomas Cromwell. Elyot and Cromwell had been friends since about 1519-20.[2] At this time Cromwell was living in London either studying law or already actively engaged in practice. Elyot was Clerk to the Justices of Assize and may well have been also pursuing legal studies himself at this time.[3] The first record of their friendship is found in a short letter addressed "To the right worshipful and my very frend Mr. Crumwell, solicitor to my lord Legatis Grace," March 25, 1528, which concludes with an invitation to visit him at his Cambridgeshire estate. "Right gladly would I see you in my poor house if you make long abode in these parts, albeit I cannot make you such cheer as you have in Oxford."[4] Elyot was also in the

---

[1]Elyot to Cromwell, July 2, 1536 (printed in Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cxxix-cxxxi). Croft attempts to tone down this declaration of Elyot's and regard it as a formal statement necessitated by More's attainder. I regard it, however, as a perfectly sincere expression of the true state of his relation with More. Elyot, as I have shown, was not and could not have been More's political partisan and that is the real question at issue.

[2]See Elyot's Latin letter to Cromwell, which accompanied a presentation copy of his dictionary (Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cxxxix-cxl). Elyot recalls that this is the nineteenth year since they first met. The summary of this letter given in Letters and Papers, XIII, Pt. II, 356, reads "21 years ago," but this is an error. The Latin reads "quod non mentior tute iudicaveris primi congressus nostri menior, a quo his quidem annus est undevigesimus, ..."

[3]Supra, p. 92.

[4]Letters and Papers, Addenda, I, Pt. I, 193.

service of Wolsey at this time as Clerk of the Council, and after Wolsey's attainder both Elyot and Cromwell went over to the Boleyn faction. Several of Elyot's letters to Cromwell are extant and confirm the impression that a warm personal friendship existed between them. In 1534 he dedicated the Castel of Helth to him. In a personal letter which probably accompanied a presentation copy, he asks Cromwell to accept this book, even though it is repetitious in places. "As it is I pray you take it in goode part, and after your olde gentill manere defend your frende in his true meaning agayne theim whoes myndes have suche a fever contynuall that every goode counsaile is in their taste unsavery and bitter."[1] Two letters concern a grant of monastic land which Elyot requested as a reward for his services as one of Cromwell's commissioners.[2] We know that Elyot received such a grant in December, 1539, undoubtedly through the good offices of Cromwell.[3] The last letter we have is the Latin letter of 1538 which accompanied the presentation copy of the Dictionary. There Elyot refers in very glowing language to their friendship, recalling that this is the nineteenth anniversary of their first meeting.[4]

Cromwell, like Elyot, was a strong nationalist who believed that the monarch should enjoy absolute power. This gave a firm foundation to their long political friendship. I should like to emphasize here that Cromwell was a man of deep political convictions.[5] It is a mistake to accept the popular estimate, based largely on Pole's Apologia, that Cromwell was an emissary of the devil, a low-born villain who truckled to Henry's every whim. Opportunist he was, but long before he became Henry's faithful servant, as a student and admirer of Italian Renaissance culture, he became imbued with the very political thought we have studied in Petrarch, in Palmieri, in Pontano, and in Patrizi, with the doctrines of secularism and absolutism which were characteristic

---

[1] Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cix ff.

[2] Ibid., pp. cxvi, cxxix-cxxxi.

[3] Letters and Papers, XIV, Pt. II, 298.

[4] Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cxxxix-cxl.

[5] See Professor Paul Van Dyke's essay "Thomas Cromwell" in Renascence Portraits (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), for a stimulating re-examination of all the facts concerning Cromwell.

of Italian political thought of this period. Cromwell, too, was devoted to the cause of the New Learning, but as a self-made, substantial London burgher and lawyer, he saw in these new trends the means to bring about immediate political reforms, to combat the forces of feudalism and clericalism, hated by every London burgher. The classical scholar was by no means the only product of the New Learning. Had not Cromwell been sincere in these convictions, and had he not been a man of some cultural attainments and intellectual discernment we can be sure that in the obscurity in which he lived in 1519, he would not have been befriended by the high-minded and scholarly Thomas Elyot, gentleman and son of a prominent justice, friend of More, and pupil of Linacre. Cromwell and Elyot became friends because both were under the spell of Italian culture; both were secular-minded; and both were patriotic nationalists. In a letter to Cromwell in 1536 concerning the Royal Proclamation banning certain seditious books, Elyot addresses him as one "whom I have allway accompted one of my chosen frendes for the similitude of our studies which undoubtidly is the most perfeict fundacion of amitie."[1] He goes on to say, in a passage quoted in another connection, that his library contains mainly books "concerning humanitie and morall philosophy" and that he never delighted in books concerning the Holy Scriptures.[2] Cromwell's intellectual interests, especially his interest in Italian literature and in political writings generally, are, therefore, of some importance for our study. Elyot's statement of the similarity of their studies together with the fact that they were members of the same faction at Court suggests that, in the decade of their friendship before the publication of The Governour, Cromwell, who had the more aggressive and forceful personality of the two, probably had a strong influence on Elyot's development as a political thinker. Certainly the circumstances attending the appearance of The Governour suggest that Cromwell was instrumental in having it published at that particular time, as we shall see.

Cromwell was known at Court for his love of all things Italian. As a young man he had travelled in Italy; he had learned the language; and on his return to England he continued to read

---

[1] Printed in Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, cxxiv ff.

[2] Supra, p. 87.

Italian books, and seek the friendship of Italian merchants.[1] In 1530 Edmund Bonner, who was soon to go to Italy on an embassy for the king, wrote to Cromwell:

> Right worshipfull, in my veray hartiest maner I commende me to you. And wher ye willing to make me a good ytalion promised unto me, long agon, the Triumphes of Petrarche in the Ytalion tongue. I hartily pray you at this tyme by this beyrer, Mr. Augustine his servant, to sende me the said Boke with some other at your devotion; and especially, if it please you, the boke called Cortigiano in ytalion, and if her or other wher I may doo you like pleasure or service, you may and shall at youre pleasure commande me, as God best knoweth who will kepe you and sende you hither shortely. At Scroby, with my Lords Grace, by the rude hande of hym that is all hartely yo own. Edmond Boner.[2]

Cromwell's possession at this time of Castiglione's Il cortegiano is especially interesting. This book was first published in Venice in April, 1528. Apparently, Cromwell was receiving shipments of new books from Italy almost immediately after publication either directly or through Italian friends in London. Elyot's knowledge of this book we shall note later. There is further correspondence between Bonner and Cromwell which is indicative of the latter's interest in Italian culture. In December, 1532, Bonner sent him a dialogue entitled Dialogus morphorii et pasquilli. He writes:

> This dialoge bytwen Marforius and Pasquillus, which of late cam to my handes, I doo send to your Maystership to laughe, not havyng a better thing as I moche desired. Your Maystership dothe, I knowe, well remember the great statua lyeng benethe the Capitole whiche is called Marforius; and as for Mr. Pasquillus ye knowe, I know well.[3]

Cromwell must have shown this work to Elyot very soon after he received it, for in the following year Elyot published an adaptation of it in English entitled Pasquil the Playne. This incident sheds some light on the closeness of the relationship existing between Cromwell and Elyot. Cromwell kept up this interest in Italian culture to the end of his life despite the arduous duties of his last years in office. In 1539 Henry Lord Morley writes to Cromwell that he is sending him two of the works of Machiavelli in Italian, the History of Florence and The Prince. In the history, he calls his attention especially to the eighth book, to the

---

[1]Roger Bigelow Merriman, Thomas Cromwell (London: Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1902), I, 1-16.

[2]Ellis, Original Letters, 3d ser., II, 177-78.

[3]Croft, "Life of Elyot," Elyot, The Governour, I, xcvii-xcviii.

war waged by the Florentines against the Papacy and the Kingdom of Naples. "As the King's cause is somewhat like, note how little the Florentines reputed the Romish bishop's cursings. Show the very words to the King; his majesty shall be pleased to see them."[1] He recommends The Prince as a book new to Cromwell. He calls it "A good thing for your Lordship and for our Sovereign Lord in Council."[2] This reference to Machiavelli's Il principe is interesting in connection with Reginald Pole's assertion in his Apologia that in a conversation with Cromwell about 1528-1529 Cromwell recommended to him a book which he later discovered to be The Prince.[3] And, since then, historians have been too ready to believe that Machiavelli's Prince was the inspiration of Cromwell's diabolical career.[4] Professor Van Dyke, however, has shown quite conclusively in his exhaustive re-examination of the Apologia that the book Cromwell recommended to Pole was not The Prince but Castiglione's Il cortegiano.[5] He points out that the subject of Pole's and Cromwell's conversation, the attitude of the prudent counselor toward his prince, is discussed by Castiglione but not by Machiavelli, and that Cromwell's position on this point can be well supported by passages from Il cortegiano.[6] Cromwell almost

---

[1] Letters and Papers, XIV, Pt. I, 110. [2] Ibid.

[3] Paul Van Dyke, Renascence Portraits, Appendix, pp. 394-5.

[4] R. B. Merriman, Thomas Cromwell, I, 86-87; H.A.L. Fisher, The History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of Henry VIII, 1485-1547 (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1906), p. 296.

[5] Van Dyke, Renascence Portraits, pp. 400-01.

[6] Baldessar Castiglione, Il libro del cortegiano (Padova: Giuseppe Comino, 1766), p. 98: "Voi v'ingannate assai, rispose Messer Federico, perchè gli adulatori non amano i Signori, ne gli amici; il che io vi dico che voglio che sia principalmente nel nostro Cortegiano; e 'l compiacere, e secondar le voglie di quello a chi si serve, si puo far senza adulatore; perchè io intendo delle voglie che siano ragionevoli, ed oneste, ovvero di quelle che in se non son nè buone, nè male, come saria il giuocare, darsi più ad uno esercizio; che ad un altro: ed a questo voglio che il Cortegiano s'accomodi, sebben da natura sua vi fosse alieno, di modo, che sempre che 'l Signore lo vegga, pensi che a parlar gli abbia di cosa che gli sia grata; il che interverrà, se in costui sarà il buon guidicio, per conoscere ciò che piace al Principe; e lo ingegno, e la prudenza, per saperseli accomodare, e la deliberata volontà per farsi piacer quello che forse da natura gli dispiacesse: ed avendo queste avvertenze, innanzi al Principe non starà mai di mala voglia, nè melanconico, nè cosi taciturno, come molti, che par che tenghino briga coi patroni; ch' è cosa veramente odiosa."

certainly did not read Machiavelli before 1539, when Lord Morley sent the two books already mentioned.[1] The evidence we have of Cromwell's reading is sufficient proof of his interest in Italian culture and of his ability to win the friendship of men of literary tastes. Among these learned friends he numbered, in addition to Elyot, Miles Coverdale, Henry Morley, Richard Morrison, and John Palsgrave.[2]

Even though Cromwell did not read Machiavelli until the year before his death, it is not entirely without reason that their names have since been linked. Cromwell admired the political ideals of fifteenth-century Italy reflected in part by Machiavelli--the ideal of national unity, the ideal of the strong leader whose very patriotism was the excuse for his unscrupulousness, the ideal of the efficient, business-like administration of state affairs, the ideal of public service as a noble career, and the ideal of the courtier as a dependent of the prince who should seek first of all to please his master.[3] These secular and absolutist doctrines were the weapons Henry needed in dealing with the Papacy,

---

[1] In the "Appendix" to his Renascence Portraits, Professor Van Dyke presents the following arguments against the reliability of Pole's Apologia as historical evidence: (1) It is violently polemical in spirit; (2) The conversation which Pole recounts occurred ten years before and contains a supposedly verbatim report of a 1500 word speech of Cromwell's to the King, which he admits he had heard of only indirectly; (3) Pole's assertion that he left England in 1531 because of the power of Cromwell is weak when we consider that Cromwell was not powerful enough to gain the notice of ambassadors until 1533. More cogent reasons for Pole's departure can be advanced; (4) Pole did not come to regard Cromwell as a deadly enemy until 1537; (5) Machiavelli's Il principe did not appear in print until 1531 and manuscripts of this work were very rare. Furthermore Cromwell left Italy before the work was written, so he could not have procured a copy at that time; (6) Lord Morley, a friend of Cromwell, sent him a copy of The Prince in 1539. In his letter he discusses Machiavelli as a writer with whom Cromwell is unfamiliar. Surely, if Machiavelli had been Cromwell's favorite reading since 1529, Morley would have known it. Van Dyke advances the theory that the book in question was Il cortegiano, which we know from Bonner's letter was in Cromwell's possession, and which treats the very topic in question. Machiavelli has nothing to say about the relation of the counselor to his prince. Finally Pole says that it was not until sometime after the conversation took place that he learned that the book which Cromwell offered to lend him was The Prince (pp. 377-418). L. A. Weissberger, in a more recent study, "Machiavelli and Tudor England," Political Science Quarterly, Vol. XLII (1927), accepts Van Dyke's conclusions.

[2] Van Dyke, Renascence Portraits, p. 237. [3] Supra, p. 102.

and in Cromwell he discovered the very embodiment of them. Cromwell, undoubtedly, sincerely believed that the prosecution of the divorce, the separation from the Papacy, and the establishment of a national Church were wise measures which every patriotic Englishman should support. In 1531 the hopeless antagonism between the spirituality and the temporality was recognized as a notorious fact.[1] This anti-clericalism was strongest in the great commercial centers of England, in Cromwell's own burgher class, among merchants, tradesmen, and other men of business. Cromwell did not enter Henry's service entirely as an ambitious opportunist and adventurer but as the representative of a growing and powerful class of Englishmen, and, we can be sure, it was with the stanch support of this group that he undertook, in the years 1530-1533, to win popular support for his bold secular and nationalistic policies. He appealed to the English people by the printing press, by the pulpit, and in Parliament.[2]

The thoroughness with which Cromwell undertook this campaign for enhancing England's national greatness at the expense of the Papacy is a tribute to his intelligence and political sagacity. In 1530 Henry sent Edward Leighton to Oxford to procure the articles upon which Wyclif had been condemned and the confirmation of these articles by the Council of Constance.[3] In view of Henry's well-known hatred of heresy and heretics he must have been following Cromwell's advice in seeking to find in Wyclif's doctrines support for his own policies. In the same year Cromwell sent to Stephen Vaughan, an English agent then in Flanders, for the dialogues of Ockham.[4] At this same time and continuing until 1532 Cromwell was very much interested in the ideas of William Tyndale. Cromwell had probably read The Obedience of a Christian Man, in which the "theory of 'one King, one law in the realm; no class of men exempt from the temporal sword, no law except the law of the land'" was advanced.[5] Vaughan had written enthusiastically in a letter of January, 1531, to Cromwell that Tyndale is a

---

[1]H. A. L. Fisher, The Political History of England 1485-1547, p. 292.

[2]Van Dyke, Renascence Portraits, p. 192.

[3]Letters and Papers, IV, Pt. III, 2946. [4]Ibid., V, 29.

[5]Merriman, Thomas Cromwell, I, 99.

man "of greater knowledge than the King takes him for, as appears by his work." Cromwell, however, failed to bring about a rapprochement between the king and Tyndale. In the works of these three anti-Papal writers Cromwell was interested only in the political doctrines that lent support to his theories of secular absolutism. Being entirely secular-minded, Cromwell was unconcerned with the theological opinions of any of these writers.[1] But Henry was and it is doubtful if he welcomed the support of these arch-heretics whom Cromwell foisted upon him. Certainly his attempt to win Henry over to Tyndale nearly lost him the royal favor.[2] From all these facts we may conclude that, in the years 1530-1532, Cromwell overlooked no possibility for supporting and popularizing his secular policies.

But there was another very obvious possibility in addition to the political doctrines of the medieval Imperialist writers and the modern Protestants; that support lay in the humanistic political doctrines of Renaissance Italy. Petrarch, Pontano, Patrizi all exalted the conception of the secular state. Furthermore, these humanistic writings ignored theological issues which were offensive to Henry. Now Cromwell was probably not familiar, at first hand, with these humanistic political treatises, but they were the favorite reading of his friend, Sir Thomas Elyot. And considering the campaign Cromwell was waging in 1530-1532 and the difficulties he was encountering with Henry, it is more than likely that Elyot pointed out to him the value of these humanistic doctrines for the cause in which they were both interested and undertook The Boke Named the Governour, which appeared in 1531, if not at Cromwell's suggestion, certainly with Cromwell's enthusiastic approval. It is more than a coincidence that The Governour, in which the ideals of patriotism, nationalism, absolutism, and bureaucratic efficiency are expressed--Cromwell's entire political program--should appear at the very time that Cromwell was making his most strenuous attempts to popularize these secular ideals. The circumstances attendant upon the publication of The Governour point overwhelmingly to the conclusion that Cromwell, the master politician, saw the "propaganda - value," to use a twentieth-century phrase, of Elyot's humanistic political views and induced

---

[1] Van Dyke, Renascence Portraits, p. 180.

[2] Merriman, Thomas Cromwell, I, 101.

him to publish them at this crucial time.

While Cromwell was an admirer and student of the methods and practices of Italian statesmen, Elyot was primarily an admirer of the doctrines inspired by the humanistic studies which characterized much of the political thought of the Italian Renaissance. Elyot as a leading English Humanist, of course, carried on his own classical studies and there can be no doubt, from the wealth of allusion in The Governour and other works, that he studied the ancients long and well. Still the main outlines of his political thought follow closely the humanistic doctrines that had been current in Italy since the time of Petrarch. The ancient treatises to which Elyot is principally indebted are identical with those already noted as the sources of similar Italian treatises[1] and the use he made of these treatises was influenced largely by the previous studies of Italian Humanists. Thus the vital problem in studying the sources of The Governour lies not in Elyot's use of classical material, but in studying the Italian political writings which both formed his opinions and suggested the form in which his own treatise should be written. In the following pages I shall point out the principal Italian treatises to which Elyot is indebted in the various sections of The Governour and offer an explanation for the apparent lack of order in the treatment of topics in Books II and III.

This is a problem of some difficulty. Elyot does not closely follow the form of any single preceding treatise. Generally speaking he follows the "natural" mode of presentation noted in Palmieri and used by Patrizi. We know that Elyot used Patrizi's De regno et regis institutione as a model, which he follows quite closely in Book I, but in Books II and III he departs widely from Patrizi. In fact, there seems to be no order or organization of the topics treated in these books. Patrizi's discussion of the virtues follows the usual order--wisdom, temperance, courage, and justice, with their various divisions and sub-divisions; Elyot's treatment follows no such plan at all. His failure to follow Patrizi's simple arrangement, obviously advantageous as it was, suggests that he had other books at his elbow besides the Patrizi, and that in the later books, particularly Book II, he was indebted

---

[1] Supra, pp. 32-33. (This and certain subsequent notes refer to the complete dissertation, which is to be found only in the University of Chicago Libraries.)

to quite a different type of treatise. We can best approach this problem by studying successively the three books of The Governour.

Elyot undoubtedly had Patrizi's De regno in mind when he wrote Book I of The Governour. In this book Elyot condenses the material of Patrizi's first three books, the preliminary remarks on kingship, the early education, and the physical exercise of the young prince.[1] Still, while the form was suggested by Patrizi's treatise and the views presented are roughly similar, the actual treatment of topics is almost entirely in Elyot's own language, and evidence of Elyot's originality is not lacking. In Chapter I in defining the "publike weale" Elyot makes use of Patrizi's distinction between populus and plebs.[2] In Chapter II on "The Best Governaunce" Elyot uses many of the same standard arguments for monarchy advanced by Patrizi.[3] Chapter III, on Magistrates, has no relation to Patrizi. Chapters IV, V, and VI, which discuss successively the qualifications for the nurse, education in infancy, and the office of the tutor, follow Patrizi closely, but, of course, on these matters most writers agreed. In Chapter VII to XI, on the best course of study for the governor or prince there is evidence of Elyot's originality. Patrizi passes rapidly over instruction in poetry as a subject whose importance is universally recognized. Elyot, writing for a less cultivated audience than Patrizi's, discusses the best Greek and Latin poets at length and finds it necessary to defend the study of poetry itself. His enthusiasm led him to defend even the obscene passages of the comic poets, Ovid, and others as valuable in education. Here he found himself in complete disagreement with Patrizi, who would bann all obscene poetry and take Plato's view that poets should write only in order to make men good and to show that only good men are happy.[4] Elyot also introduces a chapter here (chap. viii), on painting and carving, which is not to be found in Patrizi. He agrees with Patrizi in attaching great importance to the study of history (chap. xi) and his arguments for its utility follow Patrizi closely.[5] He also takes Patrizi's view on music as a necessary part of instruction.[6] However, he entirely omits

---

[1] Supra, pp. 57-61.

[2] Patrizi, De regno, p. 9.

[3] Ibid., pp. 10 ff.

[4] Ibid., p. 57.

[5] Ibid., pp. 57 ff.

[6] Ibid., Bk. II, tit. xv.

Patrizi's long discourse on the importance of astronomy.[1] The two chapters of The Governour which are based almost exclusively on Patrizi are Chapters XVII and XVIII on "Various Exercises" and on "Ancient Hunting"; Patrizi devotes all of Book III to the forms of physical exercise, from which Elyot has translated many passages literally.[2] It is clear, then, that Elyot took from Patrizi only those ideas which he considered valuable to his own plan for English education. We shall return to other original features of Elyot's program later.

The conclusive evidence of Elyot's use of the De regno et regis institutione is to be found, of course, in the passages, literally translated, which he included in the text of The Governour, for, it must be remembered, Elyot nowhere acknowledges his indebtedness to Patrizi nor even mentions his name.[3] Ordinarily we should regard such borrowings as of the highest importance. Actually, in this instance, they are of little or no importance in studying the influence of Patrizi upon Elyot. Examination of these passages reveals that, without exception, they are translations, paraphrases, or summaries of passages from ancient works, containing chiefly historical anecdotes, which Patrizi had made

---

[1] Ibid., tit. xvi. [2] Infra, n. 3.

[3] The following table lists the passages from De regno et regis institutione which Elyot incorporated into Book I of The Governour.

Patrizi, De regno:	Elyot, The Governour, Vol. I, Bk. I:
1) "Prooemium," Bk. II, p. 36.	1) Chap. viii, p. 46.
2) Bk. II, tit. iv, p. 48.	2) Chap. vii, p. 47.
3) Bk. II, tit. viii, p. 56.	3) Chap. vii, p. 40.
4) Bk. II, tit. x, p. 57.	4) Chap. xi, p. 82.
5) Bk. II, tit. xiv, p. 66.	5) Chap. viii, p. 82.
6) Bk. II, tit. xv, p. 69	6) Chap. vii, pp. 41-42.
7) Bk. III, tit. ii, p. 78.	7) Chap. xvii, pp. 184-86.
8) Bk. III, tit. ii, p. 79.	8) Chap. xvii, pp. 182-86.
9) Bk. III, tit. iii, p. 82.	9) Chap. xvii, p. 174.
10) Bk. III, tit. iii, p. 82.	10) Chap. xvii, p. 175.
11) Bk. III, tit. iii, p. 83.	11) Chap. xvii, p. 176.
12) Bk. III, tit. iv, p. 85.	12) Chap. xvii, p. 179.
13) Bk. III, tit. iv, p. 85.	13) Chap. xvii, p. 177.
14) Bk. III, tit. iv, p. 86.	14) Chap. xvii, p. 179.
15) Bk. III, tit. iv, p. 86.	15) Chap. xvii, p. 180.
16) Bk. III, tit. iv, p. 86.	16) Chap. xvii, p. 181.
17) Bk. III, tit. vi, p. 90.	17) Chap. xviii, p. 190.
18) Bk. III, tit. vii, p. 96.	18) Chap. xviii, pp. 197-98.
19) Bk. III, tit. xiv, p. 109.	19) Chap. xi, p. 78.
20) "Prooemium," Bk. IV, p. 110.	20) Chap. x, p. 59.

See also Elyot, The Governour, Vol. I, Appendix F.

and included in his compilation. Not a single passage Elyot translated contains a statement that may be regarded as original with Patrizi. This fact suggests a probable explanation for Elyot's failure to acknowledge Patrizi as a source for his own work. Apparently, Patrizi did not enjoy a very high reputation among leading Renaissance Humanists. Vives wrote in 1531:

> We can read the two works of Franciscus Patritius de Republica et de Regno, books of great comprehensiveness. In these books he has brought together the works and deeds of many peoples. He scarcely added anything of his own. He is lazy and sluggish in many places. He has collected without exercising any wise choice and judgment. Yet these two books are especially useful in their profusion of anecdotes.[1]

The manner in which Elyot used the De regno suggests that Elyot had substantially the same opinion of this work that Vives had. He regarded the work principally as a useful collection of anecdotes which he did not scruple to draw upon without acknowledgment. This practice was by no means uncommon during the Renaissance. Unfortunately, Elyot's work suffers from many of the same defects which Vives criticizes in Patrizi. Elyot was undoubtedly attracted to this work because of the political doctrines it upheld, principally for the lofty, idealistic conceptions of the prince which it advanced; yet the very looseness and incoherence of the treatment resulted, no doubt, in similar faults in The Governour which are not characteristic of Elyot's other literary productions. In conclusion, Patrizi's De regno furnished Elyot in the first Book of The Governour with a convenient compilation of political doctrine and literary allusion, much of which he was familiar with from other sources, and undoubtedly suggested the form in which he wrote his own work, but he selected this material with reference to his own program for the education of the English governing class.

While it is not necessary to seek a further source in order to account for the composition of Book I of The Governour, there are several striking similarities to be pointed out between this first book and Book I of Matteo Palmieri's Della vita civile, which we have already studied in some detail.[2] There we had

---

[1] Foster Watson (ed.), Vives: on Education, a Translation of the De tradendis disciplinis of Juan Luis Vives (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1913), p. 260.

[2] Supra, chap. iii.

occasion to note that Palmieri, like Elyot, chose to write in the vernacular for the purpose of accomplishing educational reforms which he deemed necessary to the well-being of the state. Further, the conception of the optimo cittadino bears a close resemblance to Elyot's ideal governor. Both conceptions go back ultimately, of course, to the Guardians of Plato's Republic. Palmieri, more than any other humanistic writer we have noted before Elyot, preached the duty of recognizing one's civic responsibilities, praised a career in the public service as the noblest human employment, and, above all, emphasized the importance of humanistic educational ideals in training the young man for these future responsibilities. Elyot, a century later, was inspired by this same patriotic devotion to the state and formulated identical secular ideals for the improvement of the "publike weale."

Palmieri had adopted in his treatise, as we have seen, what he called the natural mode of presentation, and in the first book he conducted the future governor through the early stages of his life, concluding with advice to be followed in choosing a career. The treatment is very similar to Elyot's; the directions for selecting a nurse and later a tutor present striking parallels. But, of course, this may be accounted for by the indebtedness of both writers to a common source, namely, Quintilian's Institutio oratoria. However, there is evidence in Book I which suggests that Elyot may have known this treatise. Palmieri concludes his section on the qualifications of the tutor with the familiar story of Philip's letter to Aristotle announcing the birth of Alexander and engaging Aristotle to be his tutor.[1] Elyot uses this anecdote in the same context and includes an English version of Philip's letter.[2] Patrizi tells this anecdote but in a different context. Of course, we may find a common source for both Palmieri's and Elyot's versions of this story in Quintus Curtius's life of Alexander. A further similarity in this first book is found in the emphasis which both writers place on the importance of following the bent of one's own genius. Palmieri concludes his first book with a long passage on knowing one's capacities and one's

---

[1] Supra, p. 37.

[2] Elyot, The Governour, I, 51.

limitations.[1] Elyot, in his chapter on painting and carving urges parents to allow the child to develop whatever talents and abilities he has; and in his chapter on the study of law he makes a similar plea, alluding to the passages in Cicero's De officiis, which, again, may be a common source for both writers.[2] And finally, there is a very strong similarity in the views of Palmieri and Elyot on what constitutes nobility. Although this topic is not treated in the first book, I should like to point out that both conclude their definitions by appealing to the example of the ancient Romans when they chose Numa Pompilius to be their king.[3] While this evidence is not sufficient to establish the Della vita civile as a source for The Governour, it does demonstrate the similarity in the studies which both pursued and the similarity in the political conceptions which both developed.

And a possibility exists that Elyot may have been familiar with Palmieri's work. This treatise was published for the first time in Florence in 1529. Further, we know that Cromwell was a collector of books in Italian: the Il cortegiano, published in 1528, was in his hands before 1530.[4] The Della vita civile with its secular and patriotic political ideals, a product of the New Learning in the vernacular, was a book which would have appealed to Cromwell very strongly. Certainly, if Cromwell did possess the

---

[1] Supra, p. 41.

[2] Elyot, The Governour, I, 43 and 138.

[3] Palmieri writes: "I sapientissimi antichi che sempre dilatorone gli Imperii spesse volte forestieri, lavoratori, & infime conditioni di huomini rilevarono a primi governi quando in loro conoscevano spectabili excellentie di virtu. Cosi anticamente i Romani postponendo tutti i loro Cittadini alla Iustitia di Numa Pompilius Sabino, piu tosto lui della citta vicina, che alchuno proprio cittadino elessono Re, et volontariamente a lui forestieri con somma pace, e stimata riputatione del Regno. XLIII anni ubidirono" (Della vita civile, p. 82).

Elyot writes: "But nowe to confirm by true histories, that accordynge as I late affirmed, nobilitie is not onely in dignitie, auncient lignage, nor great revenues, landes, or possessions. Lete yonge gentilmen have often times tolde to them, and (as it is vulgarely spoken) layde in their lappes, how Numa Pompilius was taken from husbandry, whiche he exercised, and was made kynge of Romanes by election of the people. What caused it suppose you but his wisedome and vertue? whiche in hym was very nobilitie, and that nobilitie broughte hym to dignitie" (The Governour, II, 32-33).

[4] Supra, p. 101.

Della vita civile, Elyot would have heard of it. One might even advance the hypothesis that from reading this treatise which appeared less than two years before The Governour Elyot conceived the idea of writing a similar manual in the vernacular for the training of England's "best citizens."

Still another treatise of the Italian Renaissance which probably figured in the composition of the first book of The Governour is Castiglione's Il cortegiano. In the eighth chapter of Book I of The Governour Elyot recommends the arts of painting and carving, that is, sculpture, as proper studies for the prince. Now Patrizi makes no mention of these arts, nor does any other writer on the subject of the prince's education with whom I am familiar. The prince might without loss of dignity practice the arts of music and poetry merely as recreation but not painting or sculpture. These latter were regarded as too closely allied to the manual arts. Elyot's recommendation is therefore a startling one. Castiglione, however, had treated both painting and sculpture as suitable accomplishments for the courtier, and the discussion of this topic is very similar to Elyot's.[1] Castiglione first appeals to the example of famous Romans who excelled in painting. Elyot begins in the same way but with different and more numerous examples. Both writers then discuss the utility of the art of painting, particularly in war.[2] And, finally both call attention to the pleasure to be derived from this art. Quite probably, Elyot adapted this chapter from Castiglione's discussion, which he read in Cromwell's copy of the 1528 edition.[3]

---

[1]Elyot, The Governour, I, 43 ff.

[2]Castiglione, Il cortegiano, p. 72: "Non mancarono ancor molti altri di chiare famiglie celebrate in quest' arte; della qual', oltra che in se nobilissima e degna sia, si traggon molte utilità, e massimamente nella querra, per disegnar paesi, siti, fiumi, ponti, rocche, fortezze, e tai cose; le quali, se ben nella memoria si servassero (il che però è assai difficile) altrui mostrar non si possono."

Elyot, The Governour, I, 44-45: "Also, by the feate of portraiture or paynlyng, a capitaine may discrive the countray of his adversary, whereby he shall eschue the daungerous passages with his hoste or navie: also perceyve the placis of advauntage, the forme of embataylynge of his ennemies: the situation of his campe, for his mooste sueritie: the strength or weakeness of the towne or fortresse which he intendeth to assault."

[3]Pearl Hogrefe in "Elyot and 'The Boke Called Cortegiano in Ytalion,'" Modern Philology, XXVII (1929-1930), 303-11, discusses the influence of Castiglione's Il cortegiano on Elyot's

Extensive as Elyot's borrowing is in this first book both from classical and Renaissance literatures, and much as he relied upon the treatises of Italian Humanists for the broad outlines of his educational and political programs, The Governour remains a characteristically English book. One cannot escape the impression that Elyot was a patriotic Englishman first and a Humanist only second. What he presents in The Governour is a specifically national program for educational and political reform. Elyot was a student of English history and was probably himself the author of a work on this subject.[1] Frequent references in The Governour

---

thought and especially on The Governour.

I call attention to this article because, while I am convinced that Elyot read this book, I regard Miss Hogrefe's argument in support of this point as quite inadequate, and her conclusions as to the extent of Castiglione's influence extravagant. As evidence of this influence she calls attention to (1) Elyot's emphasis upon physical exercise and sports, (2) his aristocratic attitudes; she contrasts Elyot's love of princes with Erasmus's, More's, and Vives's hatred of them, (3) Elyot's acceptance of monarchy as the best form of government and his belief in the hierarchy of estates as the foundation of the public weal.

Miss Hogrefe regards Il cortegiano as the source of these ideas in Elyot. She notes that Castiglione is uniformally complimentary to kings and to nobility, and that he, too, defends monarchy as the best form of government. "Castiglione had previously expressed the same preference for a monarchy as a government more agreeable to nature and one more like the government of God himself. Armies, ships, and buildings, he argued, are managed by one person; all parts of this human body obey the heart; animals such as deer, cranes, and bees, have a prince or king to whom they are most obedient; and as the sun and the moon in the firmament show a certain likeness to God, so good princes show us a reflection of God's justice, reason, and understanding" (pp. 307-08).

Now, all these so-called points of similarity are commonplaces in Renaissance political thought, especially in the humanistic treatises of the period. All the educational and political doctrines for which Miss Hogrefe considers Castiglione as the source are expressed in Patrizi's De regno et regis institutione in a form which much more nearly approximates Elyot's formulation of them. Of course, Patrizi's is not the only work from which Elyot could have got them. These doctrines, as we have seen, are characteristic of humanistic political thought, especially in Italy. Castiglione's book reflects them, of course, but that proves nothing.

There are other grounds for believing, however, that Elyot did read Castiglione and that his discussion of painting and carving was suggested by it. The fact that Cromwell owned Il cortegiano and praised it publicly (I accept Van Dyke's interpretation of the Apologia, which, by the way, Miss Hogrefe ignores) and the fact that Elyot was his close friend alone make it probable. The close parallel between the discussions of painting and sculpture in Il cortegiano and The Governour furnishes additional evidence.

[1] Supra, p. 91.

show his familiarity with the past of his own country. In Chapter II he concludes his long list of the world's great kings with England's "noble kynge Edgar," who made of England a great nation, and Henry VIII who again is reviving that greatness following the long civil wars.[1] Elyot was also keenly aware of the social conditions prevailing in his own time, principally the deplorable state of learning. In Chapters XII and XIII and XV, for which there is no source in Patrizi, he reviews these conditions and complains bitterly of the indifference of parents to education and the incompetence of schoolmasters.[2] He rebukes the English nobility for their ignorance and contempt of learning, reminds them that it is no reproach to be learned, and recalls to them the example of Henry I, "one of the most noble princes that ever reigned in this realme" who "was openly called Henry beau clerke, ... and is yet at this day so named."[3] Again his chapter on the English law and on the study of law is the result of his own observation as a student of law and Clerk of Assize. And finally in the last chapter of this first book, on archery, Elyot praises England's national sport.[4] There is ample evidence here that Elyot did not merely produce a book in imitation of his Italian models. He knew English conditions and he wrote in English for Englishmen. The fact that Elyot was the only leading Humanist of his time who wrote exclusively in the vernacular attests to his patriotic nationalism.

While Elyot relied principally on Patrizi for the organization and topics of Book I, he obviously did not follow the plan of this work in his second book.[5] Patrizi's fourth book introduces the topic of virtue; then follows in the remainder of this book and in the fifth book a long discussion of the four Stoic passions. The remainder of the treatise is given over to the four cardinal virtues.[6] Elyot introduced the subject of prudence in Book I, but

---

[1] Elyot, The Governour, I, 22-24. [2] Ibid., pp. 163 ff.

[3] Ibid., p. 99. [4] Ibid., pp. 286 ff.

[5] In the entire second Book, there are only three passages taken from Patrizi: a short passage on apparel (Elyot, The Governour, II, 20) an anecdote concerning Marcus Antonius (ibid., p. 46) and the story of the woman who appealed from King Philip drunk to Philip sober (ibid., pp. 52-53).

[6] Supra, p. 56.

the discussion of the three remaining virtues does not follow in Book II, as one would expect. The question then arises, If Elyot does not follow Patrizi in this book, to what treatises, if any, is he indebted?

Book II opens with an admonition to governors who are about to enter positions of responsibility in the public weal. He lists seven "thynges" that the "governour of a publike weale ought to premeditate," six of which are taken from Erasmus.[1] As we have already noted, Erasmus and Elyot held quite different political views; Erasmus was outspoken in his denunciation of reigning princes; and his Institutio principis Christiani bristles with distrust and suspicion of worldly princes whom he rebukes for their ignorance, their sloth, and their rapacity.[2] This strong prejudice was characteristic of the leading northern Humanists; More and Vives also reflect it. The more politically-minded Italian Humanists, on the other hand, idealized the powerful and capable secular prince whose rule would of necessity be despotic. Elyot reflected the latter of these two humanistic influences the more strongly, although the former is by no means completely lacking. Elyot admired Erasmus and singled out his political treatise for especial praise. "It wold not be forgoten that the lytell boke of the most excellent doctour Erasmus Roterdamus, (whiche he wrate to Charles, now beynge emperour and than prince of Castile) whiche booke is intituled the Institution of a Christen prince, wolde be as familyare alwaye with gentilmen, at all tymes, and in every age, as was Homere with the great king Alexander, or Xenophon with Scipio; for as all men may iuge that have radde that warke of Erasmus, that there was never boke written in latine that, in so lytle a portion, contayned of sentence, eloquence, and vertuous exhortation, a more compendious abundaunce."[3] Yet this single chapter of Erasmian admonition is scarcely in keeping with the remainder of The Governour. Elyot envisaged the England of the future as a strong national monarchy with a powerful monarch at its head, while Erasmus, in his political philosophy, looked back

---

[1]Croft has worked out this indebtedness and quotes the original passages from Erasmus in Elyot, The Governour, II, 2-7, footnotes.

[2]Supra, pp. 74-76.

[3]Elyot, The Governour, I, 95.

to the medieval ideal of Christendom in which all princes were but parts of a theocratic scheme. The two ideals were not compatible.

The introduction of the Erasmian admonitions at the opening of Book II serves to set this book off completely from Book I. Indeed, careful study of Book II of The Governour shows clearly that it is a treatise complete in itself and in the ideal of the prince which it presents. The opening chapter, together with the three following, on majesty, on apparel, and on nobility, forms a general introduction and the remaining chapters present the specific admirable qualities which the prince should possess. Obviously the classification in this book is not Patrizi's. Elyot followed a quite different type of treatise and that treatise, as I think I can demonstrate conclusively, was Petrarch's treatise written for Francesco di Carrara in 1373. Beginning with Chapter V and continuing to the end of the book Elyot followed the plan of Petrarch's treatise even more closely than he followed Patrizi's De regno in Book I. The ideal governor of this book is the Petrarchan ideal of the prince which we analyzed in an earlier chapter.

Collected editions of Petrarch's Latin works containing this treatise were published in Venice in 1501 and 1503.[1] Now, while we have no express statement that Elyot owned or read this work, it is highly unlikely that so learned a Humanist as Elyot would not be familiar with the works of the earliest and most famous of all Humanists, Petrarch. We do, however, have Elyot's statement in the letter to Cromwell already referred to that in his library he had a "competent numbre" of books "concerning humanitie and morall philosophy."[2] Since Petrarch's Latin works had long been available in three editions, one might well assume, without further proof, that Elyot had read them.[3]

---

[1] Librorum Francisci Petrarche impressorum annotatio. Impressum Venetiis per Simone de Luere: impensa domini Andree Torresani de Asula. 17. Junii, 1501. Epistole rerum senilium, Liber XIV. Epsitola I.

Librorum Francisci Petrarche impressorum annotatio. Impressum Venetiis per Simonem Papien ser dictum Bibliaquam. Anno domini. 1503, die vero. 15. Iulii. Epistole rerum senilium, Liber XIV, Epistola I.

[2] Supra, p. 87.

[3] The first collected edition of Petrarch's works appeared in 1496 at Basil. I have not been able to examine a copy of this edition. However, according to the table of contents reprinted in the Catalogue of the Petrarch Collection, Cornell University

There is conclusive evidence, however, in the second book of The Governour that Elyot had read the treatise of 1373. A comparison of the two texts reveals that in Chapters V to XIV of Book II Elyot has reproduced in his own language, in expanded form, Petrarch's treatise on princely government. The qualities Petrarch recommends for the prince are identical with those treated in Book II; the development of each topic is similar; and the order of discussion is the same, with few exceptions. A detailed comparison follows.

(1) Petrarch's first point is that the prince should endeavor to make himself loved. There is no greater folly than the tyrant displays in seeking to make himself secure by cruelty and intimidation.[1] Elyot treats the same topic in Chapter V "Of affabilitie" and in Chapter VI on "placabilitie." "Affabilitie" Elyot defines as "a wonderfull efficacie or power in procurynge love."

> And it is in sondry wise, but moste proprely, where a man is facile or easie to be spoken unto. It is also where a man speakethe courtaisely, with a swete speche or countenance, wherwith the herers (as it were with a delicate odour) be refresshed, and alured to love hym in whom is this most delectable qualitie.[2]

Following Petrarch he censures those who think that "haulte countenance is a comelyness of nobilitie," and condemns the pride of tyrants. Both discuss Julius Caesar in this context. "Placabilitie" is a quality of self-restraint by which one refrains from being revenged on one's enemy. These two chapters present Elyot's adaptation of Petrarch's discussion.

(2) The Prince who wins the love of his people will be a benevolent prince. "Do you wish to be truly a father to your people?" Petrarch asks. "Then strive for them as you would wish to strive for your own sons."[3] The prince, Petrarch explains, should love his citizens not individually but collectively; he should love the entire republic. "You should love the multitude of your citizens as you would the members of your body, as the

---

Library, p. 2, this edition did not contain Petrarch's political treatise. I have therefore omitted to list it with the 1501 and 1503 editions.

[1] Petrarca, Lettere senili, II, 340-44.

[2] Elyot, The Governour, II, 39-40.

[3] Petrarca, Lettere senili, II, 344.

parts of your soul, because the republic is a body of which you are the head."[1] Elyot, too, in Chapter IX defines benevolence as love of country and lists many notable examples of patriotic conduct. Commenting on the incident in the Cyropaedia in which Cyrus demonstrates to Croesus the readiness of his people to give him their treasures, Elyot exclaims:

> Lorde god, what a notable historie is this, and worthy to be graven in tables of golde, considerynge the vertue and power of benevolence therin expressed. For the benevolente mynde of a governour not onely byndeth the hartes of the people unto hym with the chayne of love, more stronger than any materiall bondes, but also gardeth more sauefely his persone than any toure or garison.[2]

Both Petrarch's and Elyot's discussions of this topic were inspired by a strong sense of national patriotism.

(3) Petrarch next discusses mercy as a princely quality. He points out that mercy is not opposed to justice but that "rightly considered they are inseparably joined."[3] He distinguishes carefully between mercy and "ill-considered weakness." It is not merciful that cut-throats, traitors,and poisoners should go unpunished. Elyot develops an almost identical argument in Chapter VII: "That a governour ought to be mercifull and the diversitie of mercye and vayne pitie." (Note that Elyot has merely reversed Petrarch's order in discussing the two qualities of benevolence and mercy.) Elyot, too, is careful to point out that it is not merciful to relax law enforcement. He introduces at this point a very interesting passage on the lawlessness prevailing in England at this time and censures judges and other public officials for their "vayne pitie; wherin is contayned neither iustice nor yet commendable charitie, but rather therby ensueth negligence, contempte, dissobedience, and finally all mischiefe and incurable misery."[4]

(4) The next quality Petrarch recommends as a means of winning the love of the people is beneficence. This can best be shown toward the state as a whole.[5] The beneficent prince will

---

[1] Ibid., p. 344.

[2] Elyot, The Governour, II, 106.

[3] Petrarca, Lettere senili, II, 348.

[4] Elyot, The Governour, II, 87.

[5] Petrarca, Lettere senili, II, 348.

restore temples and public buildings and undertake useful public works. Here Petrarch makes several specific recommendations for public improvements in Padua. Following this digression, Petrarch discusses the related quality of liberality. The love of the people is won by clemency and liberality, their hatred by cruelty and avarice.[1] The latter is the more common vice. Cupidity, in a prince, is especially detestable. "God, in His kindness, has granted to you as much as is necessary to live not only honorably but in splendor and in magnificence."[2] Elyot likewise treats beneficence and liberality as related qualities in Chapter X. He observes here the identical order of Petrarch's discussion.

(5) Petrarch then enters upon a long discussion of the prince's courtiers, officials, and friends. Almost all courtiers, he observes, have this devilish cupidity (referring to the preceding discussion); they pillage the people and seek to enrich themselves by deceiving their masters.[3] The prince must beware of evil friends and try to surround himself with venerable and religious counselors and officials.[4] Petrarch, next shows how the prince may properly show his gratitude to his loyal friends.[5] He concludes this section with a discussion of friendship.[6] Turning to The Governour, one observes that Elyot has again followed the main outline of Petrarch's discussion. Chapter XI contains "A true description of amitie or frendship." In Chapter XII Elyot illustrates the preceding discussion with the long story of Titus and Gisyppus, which, of course, does not appear in Petrarch. This interpolation does not, however, impair the similarity between the two works. Elyot says that he has introduced this story here "as it were to pause and take brethe, and also to recreate the reders, which, fatigate with longe preceptes, desire varietie of mater, or some new pleasaunt fable or historie."[7] Then follows his discussion of ingratitude in Chapter XIII and in the final chapter of the second book he distinguishes between friends and flatterers. Elyot's material in these chapters is often drawn from other sources than Petrarch, principally from Cicero's De officiis. Petrarch's work is largely founded upon Cicero's treatise and he

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., p. 360. [3] Ibid., p. 362.
[4] Ibid. [5] Ibid., pp. 366-67. [6] Ibid., pp. 368 ff.
[7] Elyot, The Governour, II, 132-33.

quotes from it frequently, but in these later chapters Elyot has gone directly to Cicero for much of his discussion.

At this point the similarity between the two treatises ends. Elyot concludes the second book here and there is no further evidence of any indebtedness to Petrarch. Petrarch adds to his list a final quality, magnanimity, which he discusses in relation to humility. Elyot's chapter on magnanimity occurs in the third book but there is no similarity between the two treatments. We have noted, however, that Elyot is indebted to Petrarch for all the princely qualities discussed in Book II of The Governour, that the development of most of the topics is strikingly similar, and the order of discussion is practically identical. Elyot's use of this treatise explains his failure to follow the conventional order of Patrizi's De regno. It now becomes quite clear that while Elyot followed Patrizi throughout most of Book I, he put this book aside in Book II and modelled his discussion after Petrarch's letter to Francesco di Carrara, which he followed even more closely than he had Patrizi in the former book. In Book II of The Governour Elyot has incorporated almost the whole of Petrarch's character of the virtuous prince.

In Book III Elyot returned to Patrizi's De regno again. Although there is no correspondence in the order of topics discussed, the comparison of certain chapters shows a marked similarity in treatment. Curiously, this similarity does not begin until Chapter XIV, "Of Magnanimitie." From that point on, however, through Chapter XXIII, "Of Sapience," there is ample evidence of indebtedness to Patrizi. The chapters on ambition, abstinence and continence, temperance, moderation, sobriety in diet, and sapience closely parallel corresponding chapters in Patrizi. Further, there are in these chapters thirteen different passages literally translated from the De regno et regis institutione.[1] These

---

[1]Passages from De regno which Elyot incorporated into Book III of The Governour.

Patrizi, De regno:	Elyot, The Governour, Vol. II, Bk. III:
1) Bk. VII, tit. 8, p. 238.	1) Chap. xiv, p. 294.
2) Bk. IV, tit. 9, p. 124.	2) Chap. xvi, p. 303.
3) Bk. IV, tit. 20, p. 148.	3) Chap. xvi, p. 298.
4) Bk. VI, tit. 21, p. 210.	4) Chap. xvii, p. 304.
5) Bk. VI, tit. 21, p. 210.	5) Chap. xvii, p. 311.
6) Bk. VI, tit. 18, p. 204.	6) Chap. xx, p. 326.
7) Bk. VI, tit. 18, p. 204.	7) Chap. xx, p. 325.
8) Bk. VI, tit. 19, p. 207.	8) Chap. xxi, pp. 329-30.
9) Bk. VI, tit. 24, p. 214.	9) Chap. xxi, p. 327.

[continued]

passages differ from those in Book I in that they usually appear in the context in which Patrizi originally used them. One further humanistic influence remains to be noted in this book.

In Chapter XIII, "Of Pacience," Pontano is alluded to by name as the author of an essay on patience.[1] The only other Renaissance Humanist whose name appears in The Governour is Erasmus. The reference is significant because Pontano was also the author of an essay on the prince, as we have noted in an earlier chapter.[2] Although Elyot is nowhere specifically indebted to this essay, presumably it figured in his studies of Italian humanistic political treatises.

In the early chapters of this book, principally the discussions of justice, of fraud and deceit, of faith or fidelity, and promise and covenant, Elyot has drawn his material directly from Cicero's De officiis. Cicero is quoted on nearly every page and there is no reason to suppose an intermediate source. Scattered through Book III are several interesting reflective essays which present, in more or less original form, Elyot's speculations on moral and political philosophy. They are: Chapter III, "The thre noble counsayles of reason, societie, and knowlege"; parts of Chapter XXIV, "Of Sapience"; Chapter XXIV, "What is the true signification of understandynge"; Chapter XXV, "Of Experience whiche have preceded our tyme, with a defence of Histories"; Chapter XXVI, "The Experience or practise necessary in the persone of a governour of a publike weale"; and Chapters XXVIII-XXX which treat "Of Consultation and counsayle." This group of essays deals with the general problem of the relation of ethics and politics. The views presented here, for which Elyot is largely indebted to Plato, were later (1533) expanded in his "disputacion Platonike," Of the Knowledg whiche Maketh a Wise Man. The chapters of Book III, then, fall into three groups: the early chapters for which Elyot is directly indebted to the De officiis; chapters XIV to XXIII for which Patrizi is the principal source; and the group of more or less original essays enumerated above.

Patrizi, De regno:	Elyot, The Governour, Vol. II, Bk. III:
10) Bk. VI, tit. 26, p. 218.	10) Chap. xxii, p. 340.
11) Bk. VI, tit. 26, p. 218.	11) Chap. xxii, p. 340.
12) Bk. VI, tit. 6, p. 189.	12) Chap. xxiii, p. 350.
13) Bk. VI, tit. 10, p. 192.	13) Chap. xxiv, p. 373.

[1]Elyot, The Governour, II, 287. [2]Supra, pp. 51-54.